a peripheral device in communication with the computer and capable of being translated linearly by a user, the peripheral device comprising a force applying element adapted to apply a force to the user; and

a sensor coupled to the peripheral device to detect a position of the peripheral device to control the graphic image,

wherein the force applying element applies a force to the user based on the interaction of the graphical image with a graphical object to simulate a texture of the graphical object.

39. An interface device according to claim 38 wherein the force applying element is adapted to apply a force to the finger.

REMARKS

Claims 26-39 are presently pending in the case. Claims 15-25 have been canceled without prejudice with Applicant reserving the right to further pursue the claims in continuing applications. Claims 26-39 have been added.

The amendments are supported by the specification and the original claims. For example, new claim 26 is supported at least by Figure 5m and the associated discussion; claim 30 is supported at least by Figures 25a through 27c and by Figure 4a and the associated discussions; claim 34 is supported at least by Figure 2a; and claim 38 is supported throughout the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the present case in view of the above amendments and the remarks herein is requested.

Formal objections and rejections

The Examiner objected to the drawings, rejected claims 18 and 20 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph and rejected claims 15-23 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Though Applicant at least partially disagrees with the Examiner's position, these objections and

rejections are believed to be obviated by the cancellation of claims 15-25. Applicant reserves the right to argue the rejections and objections in subsequently filed applications.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 102

The Examiner rejected claims 15-19, 21 and 23-25 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,575,297 to Richter (Richter). This rejection, too, is believed to be obviated by the cancellation of claims 15-25. As above, Applicant will explain the distinguishing features of the claims in a continuing application.

Obviousness-type double patenting

The Examiner rejected claims 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21-25 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent 6,059,506. The Examiner also states that "a timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application."

As per the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant files herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection based on 6,059,506.

New Claims

New claims 26-39 have been submitted to set forth other distinguishing features of Applicant's invention. Claims 26-39 are fully supported by the specification as originally filed, as discussed above, and are allowable over the prior art.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is filing under separate cover an information disclosure statement in compliance with MPEP section 609. Indication of consideration of the references provided is requested.

Conclusion

The claims are allowable for the reasons given above. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the present rejections and allow the presently pending claims. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

VIRTUAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a subsidiary of IMMERSION CORPORATION

Dated: January 29, 2001

By: <u>My</u>
Guy Tucker

Reg. No. 45,302

Please direct telephone calls to:

Guy Tucker (408) 467-1900

Correspondence Address:

Guy Tucker Immersion Corporation 801 Fox Lane San Jose, California 95131